

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Official Action has been carefully considered, and the Examiner's comments are duly noted. Reconsideration of this Application in view of the amendments for the claims and the specification is respectfully solicited.

Claims 18 to 20, 25 to 27, 34 to 39 and 41 to 43 were amended. New claims 44 to 46 were added. Claims 23, 32 and 40 were cancelled. Claims 1 to 17 and 21 to 23 were previously cancelled. The claims now in this Application are claims 18 to 20, 25 to 27, 34 to 39, and 41 to 46.

For the sake of the record, in all of the claims, the term "fluid" applies to both the liquid phase and the vapor phase and the purpose is to clearly differentiate between the liquid and vapor portions of the single quantity of fluid.

Also, the two functions of the system and method have been further clarifying which are firstly to maintain a **uniform temperature** across all surfaces of the chamber and secondly to maintain a **constant temperature** within the chamber.

In addition to the new method claims 44 to 46, claims 18 to 20 and claims 35 to 39 and 41 to 43 are further defined as system claims. New claims 44 to 46 are method claims. Claim 33 has been noted as allowable.

With respect to the amendment for the specification, consideration was given to paragraph 1 on page 2 and since Applicant's attorney was not certain as to what the Examiner wanted, the amendments specifically noted in the first paragraph have been entered. With respect to the guidelines, since they are only guidelines and not requirements as Applicant's attorney understands them, only one of the sub-headings has been used and marked "not applicable" because this inventor has other subject matter on file, but it is not the type of Application which covers that particular matter. With respect to the other guidelines, it is submitted that they are not appropriate for this matter, as best understood.

Claim 18 as amended incorporates the limitation of new claim 44, as well as emphasizing the single quantity of unchanged fluid. Claim 18 and the claims dependant thereon are considered to be system claims.

Independent claims 25 to 27 have also been amended to include the features of new claim 44. Claims 28 to 31 were amended for consistency with the claims from which they depend.

Claim 33 was held to be allowable, and claims 34 and 35, which are dependent thereon, are also considered to be allowable.

Claim 36 and the claims dependent thereon were amended to take into consideration the submission of new claims 44 to 46. All of the claims are now submitted as patentably distinguishing from the prior art taken either singly or combined in any valid combination.

Claims 18-20, 24-37 and 35-43 were rejected as being anticipated by Kostura (Patent No. 4,072,181) in view of Cavazos (Patent No. 5,167,688).

Claims 32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), and these claims no longer appear in the Application.

With respect to the Examiner's comments in paragraph 6 of the Official Action, the structure to which the Examiner is giving no weight was added because the Examiner wanted more structure in the claim. The addition of the structure brought out features of the invention more specifically than was appreciated heretofore.

The elimination of a piece of structure used by the prior art, plus the use of different structure to provide a device which works between ,and produces better results is an advance over the prior art and, therefore, is directed to patentable subject matter.

The Examiner is reconstructing Kostura in the light of Applicant's disclosure. What the Examiner is doing is stating that any time a flow inlet conduit is connected with some retainer and an exit orifice is provided from the container to another conduit, that is one continuous flow pipe. Even so, the Examiner gives no weight to the position of the

conduit. How can a single closed conduit which passes through a container with no inlet into the container and no outlet from the container be used to empty into a liquid portion and exit from a vapor portion? This is neither shown nor suggested by Kostura.

With respect to some of the claims, there are other claims which now meet the statements for allowability, such as claim 27 and claims 28 to 31, which are dependent thereon.

With respect to Cavazos, as noted earlier, there is no teaching in Cavazos nor any suggestion of how to maintain a uniform temperature across all surfaces of the chamber, and to maintain a constant temperature within the chamber.

In paragraph 4, the Examiner contends that Kostura teaches an apparatus for regulating the temperature of a mold. There is a distinction between regulating the temperature of a mold and maintaining a uniform temperature across all surfaces of the chamber and a constant temperature within the chamber.

With respect to the Examiner's statement that the invention is capable of operating without being in a completely closed system, then it would not be possible to maintain a constant temperature or a uniform temperature across all surfaces of the chamber, and the Examiner is asked to give weight to these further limitations which were added to all of the claims.

Applicant also wishes to incorporate all of the arguments previously submitted even though the Examiner has given no weight to the arguments. In this respect, Kostura, as previously noted, is a regulation device. Also, the combination of air and vapor which are removed by Kostura results in contamination and destroys any possible correlation between pressure and temperature and as the Examiner well knows that this is a basic relationship which, if changed, will not produce the desired result which is to obtain the distribution of temperature across the molding surfaces as uniform as possible which is controlled by the selected temperature.

Also, there is no motivation shown anywhere nor teaching in any of the references of record of how to arrive at the claimed invention. "Motivation-suggestion-teaching"

test asks not merely what references disclose, but whether person of ordinary skill in art, possessed with understandings and knowledge reflected in prior art and motivated by general problem facing inventor, would have been led to make claimed combination in present case. There is nothing in the references regardless of how combined to make Applicant's mold system and method.

In addition to the specification amendments, an abstract has also been prepared and submitted.

It is further respectfully requested that a three months term extension be provided, and our check in the amount of \$510.00 (small entity) is enclosed.

Turning now more specifically to paragraphs 2 and 3, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and the obviousness rejection, it is submitted that this is overcome with the amendments of the claims.


Further, it is noted under paragraph 4 that claims 18 to 20, 24 to 31, and 35 to 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), and all of these rejections will now be discussed. Claims 32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of the combination of Cavazos (Patent No. 5,167,688) and Kostura (Patent No. 4,022,181).

If any fees are needed, please charge them to our Deposit Account 50-3108.

Respectfully submitted,

LACKENBACH SIEGEL, LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By:

  
J. Harold Nissen

Reg. No. 17283

Telephone No.: 914-723-4300

Direct No.: 914-723-0278

Fax No.: 914-723-4301

Enclosure: \$510.00 check for Three-Month Extension